

REMARKS

There remains pending for consideration in this application Claims 1, 3-9 and 19, with Claims 1, 8 and 9 being independent. Claims 1, 8 and 9 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for these claims can be found in the original disclosure.

The Office Action lists two objections to the specification: a first objection pertaining to the abstract of the disclosure, and a second objection pertaining to the title of the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments presented herein adequately address the Examiner's objections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states that the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time that the invention was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are adequately described in the original specification and traverse the rejection.

Applicants refer to the following paragraph of the originally-filed specification (page 30, line 24 to page 31, line 17), noted by the Examiner:

“The ambient lighting characteristic correcting matrix CR is desirably determined for each ambient illuminating light corresponding to the actual ambient situation. For example, this matrix can be obtained by determining the three stimulation values under the

above-mentioned illuminating lights and those under the standard light source, for example with a test chart containing 77 color patches as shown in Fig. 7 and executing optimization for example by the attenuated minimum square method. The above-described method can be easily executed in case the number of the required illuminating lights is limited to several kinds. In practice, however, the condition of lighting changes in various manner according to the kind of the illuminating light source, the time-dependent change thereof, and the change in the state of the incoming external light such as the solar light, and it is difficult, in the above-mentioned method, to determine the ambient lighting characteristic correcting matrix corresponding to the ambient illuminating light varying in various manners.” (emphasis added)

The highlighted phrases in the above paragraph would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art as teaching that the three stimulation values are calculated by measuring a test chart containing any number of color patches under the illuminating lights. Thus, the claimed “measurement data” is adequately described in the specification. Furthermore, because the text used in the specification is not limiting but rather is exemplary (the instances are set off by the phrase “for example”), the number of color patches, the optimization method, etc., are merely meant to be specific examples of the claimed invention. The exact details of obtaining the conversion conditions need not be recited in the claims.

Thus, all of the claimed features are adequately described in the original specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112 rejection are requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MJD:MAW:eyw